EQUALITY.

THE perverſe ſenſe impoſed on the word EQUALITY, by the folly or the fears of ſome of our countrymen, is as dangerous as it is abſurd; and they may probably ſee the day, when they may repent of having infuſed into the minds of the people a notion that the EQUALITY to be contended for is an *Equality* of *wealth* and *poſſeſſions*. If, by continually repeating this idea, the *uninformed*, or, as they are now *politely* termed, the SWINISH MULTITUDE, ſhould take it into their heads that they are juſtified in *inforcing* ſuch a ſyſtem, the conſequences will reſt on thoſe who, by a perverſion of terms, have wickedly or fooliſhly propagated ſo dangerous a doctrine. The *Equality* inſiſted on by the friends of Reform is AN EQUALITY OF RIGHTS, or, in other words, that every perſon may be *equally* intitled to the protection and benefits of ſociety; may *equally* have a voice in the election of thoſe who make the laws by which he is affected in his liberty, his life, or his property; and may have a fair opportunity of exerting to advantage any talents he may poſſeſs. The rule is not, "*Let all mankind be perpetually equal.*"——God and nature have forbidden it. But, "*Let all mankind ſtart fair in the race of life.*" The *inequality* derived from labour and ſucceſsful enterprize, the reſult of ſuperior induſtry and good fortune, is an *inequality eſſential to the very exiſtence of Society*; and it naturally follows, that the property ſo acquired, ſhould paſs *from father to ſon*. To render property inſecure would deſtroy all motives to exertion, and tear up public happineſs by the roots. Such are the truths acknowledged and avowed by the Reformers of the preſent day, and where, but in the wild workings of a diſordered imagination, do their enemies find the dangerous doctrines with which they daily alarm the public. Are they acknowledged by the Government of America? Are they to be diſcovered in the Code of the French Nation? Have they been avowed by ANY CONSTITUTIONAL SOCIETY in this kingdom? Or are there any traces of ſuch doctrines in the WORKS OF ANY MODERN REFORMER? Again, are the reformers of the preſent day leſs intereſted than their abuſers in the proſperity of their country? Are Mr. Grey, and his numerous Coadjutors, men without property? Let the oppoſers of reform come forward and anſwer theſe queſtions—Or let us hear no more of LEVELLERS and LEVELLING SYSTEMS; nor let an odium be thrown on GREAT AND UNCHANGEABLE TRUTHS from the *equivoque* of a word.

Liverpool, Dec. 1.